



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/617,530

07/10/2003

Yen-Fu Chen

AUS920030522US1

3554

45371 7590 06/20/2008

IBM CORPORATION (RUS)
c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP
2100 Ross Avenue
Suite 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

NEWAY, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/617,530
Filing Date: July 10, 2003
Appellant(s): CHEN ET AL.

Rudolph O. Siegesmund
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the Appeal Brief filed 03 March 2008 and the Supplemental Appeal Brief filed 03 April 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 17 October 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

Application No. 10/617,526 and Application No. 10/631,070 are related and on appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

Withdrawn Rejections

The Double Patenting Rejections of claims 5, 11, 12, 19, 20, 26, and 27 over the claims of Application No. 10/631,070 have been withdrawn.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Mandarintools Web Page (three pages) (available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>) along with its Chinese-English Dictionary link (two pages).

Chinese-English Lookup Web Page (four pages) (available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20010309104519/http://home.iprimus.com.au/richwarm/cel/cel.htm>).

Hughes, "1ICT3 Computer Science Sample Paper I", 1998, University of Dublin.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

Art Unit: 2626

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 13, 15 – 21, 23 – 28, and 30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 16, and 30 - 45 of copending Application No. 10/617,526 in view of <http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> (its Chinese-English Dictionary link, referred as Chinese-English Dictionary herein below).

Current Application	Co-pending Application 10/617,526
<p>1. A method comprising: using a computer having a display and connected to the internet, copying a Simplified Chinese character from a web page by highlighting the Simplified Chinese character on the web page;</p> <p>pastng the Simplified Chinese character into an input field of a graphical user interface on the display;</p>	<p>1. A method comprising: using a computer having a display and connected to the internet, copying a Simplified Chinese character into an input field of a graphical user interface;</p> <p>using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese character equivalent of a Simplified Chinese character;</p>

<p>recognizing the Simplified Chinese character without regard to an encoding format of the Simplified Chinese character;</p> <p>using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese character equivalent of a Simplified Chinese character;</p> <p>simultaneously displaying the Simplified Chinese character and the Traditional Chinese character equivalent in the graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control.</p>	<p>using Unicode to translate the Simplified Chinese character into accented Pin Yin word and an English word; and responsive to a user activation of a single control on the graphical user interface,</p> <p>simultaneously displaying the Simplified Chinese character as a Traditional Chinese character, an unaccented Pin Yin word, a hybrid Pin Yin word, and an English word.</p>
<p>2. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accepting the Simplified Chinese character as user input, wherein the Simplified Chinese character is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode.</p>	<p>2. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accepting the Simplified Chinese character as user input, wherein the Simplified Chinese character is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode.</p>
<p>3. The method of claim 1 further comprising: translating the Simplified Chinese character from GB2312 to Unicode.</p>	<p>3. The method of claim 1 further comprising: translating the Simplified Chinese character from GB2312 to Unicode.</p>
<p>4. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accessing a conversion table to determine the Traditional Chinese character.</p>	<p>4. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accessing a conversion table to determine the Traditional Chinese character.</p>
<p>5. The method of claim 4 wherein the conversion table is a JAVA hashtable.</p>	<p>5. The method of claim 4 wherein the conversion table is a JAVA hashtable.</p>
<p>6. The method of claim 1 wherein Traditional Chinese character is determined without the use of an intermediate language.</p>	<p>7. The method of claim 1 wherein Traditional Chinese character is determined without the use of an intermediate language.</p>

The current application is directed to finding the corresponding Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified) to a given Chinese word (Traditional and/or Simplified). Copending application No. 10/617,526 is directed to finding the corresponding equivalent Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified), the corresponding Pin Yin word, and/or an English word to any given word (Chinese, Pin Yin, and/or English).

Chinese-English Dictionary teaches a method of finding the corresponding equivalent Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified), the corresponding Pin Yin word, and/or an English word to any given word (Chinese, Pin Yin, and/or English) without regard to an encoding format ("searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ...", page 1, lines 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the various translations in order to help a non-native Chinese speaker learn the Chinese language by, for example, giving English translations to Chinese words.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 8 – 13 and 15 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 21 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23 – 28 and 30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

3. Claims 1 – 3, 6, 8 – 10, 13, 15 – 18, 21, 23 – 25, 28 and 30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5 – 6, 26, 30 – 31 of copending Application No. 10/631,070 in view of <http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> (its Chinese-English Dictionary link).

Current Application	Co-pending Application 10/631,070
<p>1. A method comprising: using a computer having a display and connected to the internet, copying a Simplified Chinese character from a web page by highlighting the Simplified Chinese character on the web page;</p> <p>pastng the Simplified Chinese character into an input field of a graphical user interface on the display;</p> <p>recognizing the Simplified Chinese character without regard to an encoding format of the Simplified Chinese character;</p> <p>using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese character equivalent of a Simplified Chinese character;</p> <p>simultaneously displaying the Simplified Chinese character and the Traditional Chinese character equivalent in the graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control.</p>	<p>1. A method comprising: using a computer having a display and connected to the internet,</p> <p>accepting a user input of a Simplified Chinese word at a graphical user interface on the display;</p> <p>determining if the user input is an entire desired word, a beginning of the entire word, or whether the user input appears anywhere in the desired word;</p> <p>searching a dictionary for an entry containing a Simplified Chinese word; using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese word equivalent of a Simplified Chinese word;</p> <p>using Unicode to translate the Simplified Chinese word into accented Pin Yin word and an English word; and</p> <p>responsive to a user activation of a single</p>

<p>2. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accepting the Simplified Chinese character as user input, wherein the Simplified Chinese character is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode.</p> <p>3. The method of claim 1 further comprising: translating the Simplified Chinese character from GB2312 to Unicode.</p> <p>6. The method of claim 1 wherein Traditional Chinese character is determined without the use of an intermediate language.</p>	<p>control on the graphical user interface, simultaneously displaying the Simplified Chinese word, the Traditional Chinese word equivalent, the accented Pin Yin word, and the English word.</p> <p>5. The method of claim 1 further comprising: accepting the Simplified Chinese word as user input, wherein the Simplified Chinese word is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode.</p> <p>6. The method of claim 1 further comprising: translating the Simplified Chinese word from GB2312 to Unicode.</p>
---	--

The current application is directed to finding the corresponding Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified) to a given Chinese word (Traditional and/or Simplified). Copending application No. 10/631,070 is directed to finding the corresponding equivalent Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified), the corresponding Pin Yin word, and/or an English word to any given word (Chinese, Pin Yin, and/or English).

Chinese-English Dictionary teaches a method of finding the corresponding equivalent Chinese character (Traditional and/or Simplified), the corresponding Pin Yin word, and/or an English word to any given word (Chinese, Pin Yin, and/or English)

without regard to an encoding format and where Chinese character is determined without the use of an intermediate language (“searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word”, page 1. Note that the Chinese word can be selected to be either Simp. Chinese (GB) or Trad. Chinese (Big5) as shown on top of page 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the various translations in order to help a non-native Chinese speaker learn the Chinese language by, for example, giving English translations to Chinese words. See also the 103 rejections below.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 8 – 10, 13 and 15 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 18 and 21 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23 – 25, 28 and 30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2626

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8 – 11, 13, 15 – 19, 21, 23 – 26, and 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> in view of Chinese-English Lookup

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20010309104519/http://home.iprimus.com.au/richwarm/cel/cel.htm>) referred as Lookup hereinafter.

Claim 1:

The Chinese-English Dictionary link from

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> discloses a method comprising:

using a computer having a display (“Look It Up”, Figure on page 1) and connected to the internet (“download the dictionary at the CEDICT website”, page 1),

but it does not explicitly disclose copying a Simplified Chinese character from a web page by highlighting the Simplified Chinese character on the web page and

past the Simplified Chinese character into an input field of a graphical user interface;

Lookup discloses a similar Chinese-English dictionary where a user is able to select and copy a word (where it is pasted on the dictionary window) from a Web browsers or a word processor (“user has selected and copied a word ...”, page 1) in

Art Unit: 2626

order to get a desired translation and simultaneously displaying the translated characters in the graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control (Figure on top of page 1. Note the simultaneous display of the Chinese, Pin Yin, and English equivalents).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to copy and paste words from Web pages in Chinese-English Dictionary's interface and simultaneously display the translations in response to an activation of a single control in order to "help Chinese language learners to read Chinese electronic texts in other applications such as Web browsers and word processors" (Lookup, page 1, paragraph 2).

Chinese-English dictionary further discloses recognizing the Simplified Chinese character without regard to an encoding format of the Simplified Chinese character ("searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ...", page 1); and

using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese character equivalent of a Simplified Chinese character ("searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word", page 1. Note that the Chinese word can be selected to be either Simp. Chinese (GB) or Trad. Chinese (Big5) as shown on top of page 1);

Claim 2:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses: accepting the Simplified Chinese character as user

Art Unit: 2626

input, wherein the Simplified Chinese character is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode (“return the results in GB ... or Unicode”, page 1).

Claim 3:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses: translating the Simplified Chinese character from GB2312 to Unicode (“return the results in GB ... or Unicode”, page 1).

Claim 4:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses: accessing a conversion table to determine the Traditional Chinese character (“searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word”, page 1. Note that a conversion table is inherent in the determination of equivalent characters).

Claim 6:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein Traditional Chinese character is determined without the use of an intermediate language (“searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word”, page 1. Note that the Chinese word can be selected to be either Simp. Chinese (GB) or Trad. Chinese (Big5) as shown on top of page 1).

Claims 8 – 11, 13, and 15:

Claims 8 – 11, 13, and 15 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 4, and 6; therefore claims 8 – 11, and 13, and 15 are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 19, and 21:

Claims 16 – 19 and 21 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 4, and 6; therefore claims 16 – 19 and 21 are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23 – 26, 28, and 30:

Claims 23 – 26, 28, and 30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 4, and 6; therefore claims 23 – 26, and 28, and 30 are rejected with the same rationale.

6. Claims 5, 12, 20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> in view of Lookup and in further view of Hughes (“1ICT3 Computer Science Sample Paper I”, 1998, University of Dublin)

Claim 5:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 4, but they do not explicitly disclose using a Java hashtable.

Hughes discloses a conversion table for Morse code stored in a Java hashtable (“The conversion table for Morse code can be stored in a Java Hashtable object”, page 4, question 6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a Java hashtable as the conversion table in Chinese-English Dictionary because Java is able to run on any platform.

Claims 12, 20, and 27:

Claims 12, 20, and 27 are similar in scope and content to claim 5; therefore they are rejected with the same rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments filed on 05 March 2008 and 03 April 2008 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

A. First Ground of Rejection: Double Patenting Rejection over the claims of Application No. 10/617,526

Claims 1 – 6:

Appellant argues that the Instant Application's claim 1 recites "recognizing the Simplified Chinese character without regard to an encoding format of the Simplified Chinese character" which is not disclosed by the '526 Application's claim 1 or by Chinese-English Dictionary (Appeal Brief, page 7 bottom to page 8 top). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Chinese-English Dictionary discloses recognizing Chinese (Traditional or Simplified) characters "using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings" (page 1, lines 4-6). It is noted that Simplified Chinese characters are encoded in either GB or Unicode. In other words Chinese-English Dictionary teaches recognizing Simplified Chinese characters without regard to encoding (GB or Unicode).

Appellant also argues that some limitations recited in claim 1 of the '526 Application are not recited in the Instant Application (Appeal Brief, page 8, second paragraph). It is well settled that the omission of an element/step and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re*

Art Unit: 2626

Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969). Omission of a reference element or step whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Appellant further argues that “the Examiner fails to analyze the subject matter as a whole because the Examiner distills the invention to a gist or thrust” (Appeal Brief, page 8, third paragraph). However, the Examiner has drawn a table showing conflicting claims side by side in order to show similar limitations. The limitations lacking in the claims of the ‘526 Application are thought by Chinese-English Dictionary and it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the claims in the ‘526 Application with the teachings of Chinese-English Dictionary to yield the predictable results of the Instant Application’s claims as shown above in the Double Patenting Rejections.

Claims 8 – 13, 15 – 21, 23 – 28, and 30:

Claims 8 – 13 and 15 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 21 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23 – 28 and 30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

B. Second Ground of Rejection: Double Patenting Rejection over the claims of Application No. 10/631,070

The Double Patenting Rejections of claims 5, 11, 12, 19, 20, 26, and 27 over the claims of Application No. 10/631,070 are withdrawn.

Claims 1 – 3 and 6:

The same discussions put forth in section A above apply to Appellant's arguments (Appeal Brief, page 10, second paragraph to page 12, second paragraph) regarding the Double Patenting Rejections over the claims of Application No. 10/631,070.

Claims 8 – 10, 13 and 15 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 16 – 18 and 21 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 23 – 25, 28 and 30 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 3 and 6 and are rejected with the same rationale.

C. Third Ground of Rejection: Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 – 4 and 6:

Appellant argues that the CEL Web Page (Lookup) fails to disclose a user copying and pasting a word (Appeal Brief, page 13, last paragraph, to page 14, second paragraph). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lookup discloses that a user can select and copy a word ("the user has selected and copied a word in Notepad", page 1,

section "What is CEL?"). Lookup further discloses popping up a window where the word is pasted along with its translations (page 1, CEL figure). Also, the dictionary lookup can be triggered manually ("the dictionary lookup is triggered (automatically or manually)", page 1, section "What's new in Version 2.0?") in which case the word is pasted in response to a user action. In other words the user copies and pastes the word.

Appellant also argues that some quotations from the Mandarintools Web Page cannot be found. As noted in the rejections, Chinese-English Dictionary is a link from the Mandarintools Web Page. Both the Mandarintools Web Page and the content of its Chinese-English Dictionary link were provided to Appellant attached to the First Office Action mailed 24 January 2007. It is also noted that Appellant did not have any trouble finding the Chinese-English Dictionary reference, as evidenced by responses to prior office actions, where Appellant argued, for example, that Chinese-English Dictionary "does not provide a display in response to an activation of a single control" (Amendment filed 23 April 2007, page 12, lines 4-5).

Appellant further argues that "searching with different encodings is different from recognizing without regard to an encoding format" (Appeal Brief, page 14, last paragraph). Both Appellant's claimed invention and Chinese-English Dictionary are directed to translating or finding equivalents for Chinese characters. What they are searching or recognizing are Chinese character translations or other equivalent Chinese characters. Searching for translations is the same as recognizing the translations. In claim 1, Appellant claims recognizing a Simplified Chinese character without regard to an encoding format and determining its Traditional Chinese equivalent. In other words

Art Unit: 2626

claim 1 allows Simplified Chinese characters to be encoded with either Unicode or GB, the two encoding formats for Simplified Chinese. Chinese-English Dictionary discloses Chinese characters (including Simplified Chinese) encoded with GB, Big5, or Unicode (GB and Unicode for Simplified Chinese) (page 1, lines 4-6).

Appellant also argues that Chinese-English Dictionary fails to disclose using Unicode to determine a Traditional Chinese character equivalent to a Simplified Chinese character. Chinese-English Dictionary discloses that translation or equivalent results “will show the Chinese word, the pinyin representation ...”. Note that the Traditional Chinese character can be represented using either the Big5 or Unicode encoding formats (“Searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings)”, page 1, lines 4-6). Chinese-English Dictionary also discloses that the results can be returned in “GB, Big5, or UTF-8 Unicode” (page 1, lines 26-28)

Appellant argues that the combination of Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup fails to teach “simultaneously displaying the Simplified Chinese character and the Traditional Chinese equivalent character in the graphical user interface” (Appeal Brief, page 17, top of page). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Chinese-English Dictionary discloses that “Results will show the Chinese word, the pinyin representation of the word, and the English definition” (page 1, lines 6-7) where the Chinese word can either be Simplified or Traditional. Further, Lookup discloses simultaneously displaying a Chinese (either Simplified or Traditional) character and its pinyin representation along with its English translation (page 1, Figure on top of page). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the two references and yield the

predictable result of simultaneously displaying a Simplified Chinese character along with its Traditional Chinese character.

Appellant further argues that CEL Web Pages (Lookup) fails to disclose displaying translations and equivalents of a Chinese character “in response to an activation of a single control” (Appeal Brief, page 17, second paragraph). However, Lookup discloses the user copying a word which automatically triggers a dictionary window to pop up displaying a Chinese character along with its translations and equivalents. The user copying of the Chinese word reads on Appellant’s activation of a single control. Further, Lookup does not only disclose that characters can be displayed automatically in response to detecting words in the Windows Clipboard, as Appellant puts forth, but also manually in response to a user activating a control (“the dictionary lookup is triggered ... manually”, page 1, section “What’s new in Version 2.0?”). In this case, the manual trigger reads on Appellant’s activation of a single control.

Claims 8 – 11, 13, and 15:

The Examiner’s rebuttals for Appellant’s arguments regarding claims 8 – 11, 13, and 15 are similar to those put forth for claims 1 – 4 and 6 since Appellant’s arguments presented for both set of claims are similar.

Claim 30:

Appellant argues that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 30 as similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 4 and 6 because none of these claims recite “determining if

Art Unit: 2626

the Traditional Chinese character has a Simplified Chinese character equivalent”.

However, determining **if** a Chinese character (Simplified or Traditional) has an equivalent is inherent in determining **the** equivalent for the Chinese character (as in claim 1) since the equivalent can not be determined if it does not exist. In other words, checking the existence of an equivalent is inherent in determining the equivalent.

Determining an equivalent is possible only if the equivalent exists.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel G. Neway
/Samuel G Neway/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Conferees:
David Hudspeth
/David R. Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Richmond Dorvil/R. D./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626